

**December 12, 1997
Meeting Summary**

E - 0 1 6 0 5 9

E-016059

Draft
BDAC MEETING SUMMARY
DECEMBER 12, 1997
SACRAMENTO CONVENTION CENTER
9:30 AM to 5 PM

MEETING OUTCOMES

Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. Ten BDAC members expressed opinions about the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan (ERPP) and the Scientific Review Panel recommendations. BDAC generally endorsed the Panel recommendations. Members asked for descriptions of the conceptual models and the opportunity to review the strategic plan being developed by the Program and stakeholders.

Phase II Alternatives. Fourteen BDAC members discussed two issues surrounding development of the alternatives during the plenary session: the adequacy of the distinguishing characteristics evaluation and their perspective on the alternatives. In regards to the first issue, members asked for a quantitative assessment of the alternatives and a comparison between the alternatives and the solution principles. They also pointed out apparent inconsistencies between the distinguishing characteristics evaluation and the summary of strengths and weaknesses. Regarding the second issue, BDAC members could not eliminate any of the alternatives from further consideration. They asked for more information regarding demand management, storage issues, the ERPP, water quality and diversion effects on fisheries. Several BDAC members concluded that resolving the last two issues was key to choosing a long term Bay-Delta solution.

1. WELCOME AND CHAIR'S REPORT (Sunne McPeak)

Vice Chair Sunne McPeak convened the meeting of the Bay-Delta Advisory Council (BDAC) at 9:50 AM. She noted that Chair Mike Madigan was delayed until noon as a result of re-routing due to fog at the Sacramento airport.

Vice Chair McPeak pointed out that correspondence regarding the topic of water supply deliveries to Westlands Water District was included in members packets and available to the public. She explained that discussion on the Administrative Proposal for CVPIA (b)(2) water, and on the Agriculture/Urban discussions would occur under this agenda item.

In addition to the scheduled time for general public comment, Vice Chair McPeak noted that public comment would be taken on each agenda item.

Reporting on the Administrative Proposal for CVPIA (b)(2) water, Patrick Wright (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service) stated that the final proposal was released on November 20, 1997. The proposal was distributed to BDAC members and available to the public at the meeting. Mr. Wright stated that the program will run initially for five years. The U.S. Department of the

Interior (DOI) is committed to further refining a set of "tools" outlined in the proposal to provide additional benefits as the program is implemented. He noted that the Administration is aware of concerns with and litigation filed against the proposal. He added that DOI will continue its strong commitment to the CALFED process. BDAC members Tom Graff and Ann Notthoff expressed concern that litigation opposing the proposal had been filed. The implications for the success of CALFED were negative. BDAC member Mike Stearns agreed that it was unfortunate that litigation was necessary. He added that parties in the lawsuit will stay engaged in the CALFED process, as it has the greatest chance of succeeding. Vice Chair McPeak stated that the Bay Area business community was also concerned about the litigation and its implications for the CALFED process.

Vice Chair McPeak asked Lester Snow (CALFED Program Executive Director) to report on the extension of the Bay-Delta Accord. Governor Wilson has formerly announced the signing of the Accord's extension. Additionally, the Governor also announced allocation of \$33 million for Restoration Coordination Program projects. Lester Snow added that the Program anticipates a joint announcement on December 17th on the federal allocation for the Restoration Coordination Program. Support for a balanced, equitable outcome from the CALFED process has been expressed from the highest levels in both the state and federal administrations. Vice Chair McPeak expressed appreciation to the Governor and President Clinton.

Mr. Graff noted that discussion on water supply deliveries to the Westlands Water District had not been agendaized and that correspondence new to him had been distributed at the BDAC meeting. He requested that a discussion occur on the topic in January and Vice Chair McPeak stated it would be included under the Chair's Report item.

BDAC member Steve Hall was asked by Vice Chair McPeak to report on the status of the Agriculture/Urban discussions. He reported that comments on the ERPP had been submitted to CALFED. He noted that an agreement between the Agriculture/Urban caucus and environmentalists was emerging regarding the desirable goals and process for the ERPP and that parties had a better understanding of uncertainties associated with ERPP implementation. A topic where the parties diverged is on the need for measurable improvements to water supply.

The Agriculture/Urban discussions were also addressing the need to affordably and reliably meet present and future water quality standards. Technical staff are analyzing various means to protect source water quality. He added that the need for certainty pertains to water supply and ecosystem restoration as well as to water quality. Establishing certainty would be achieved by institutional means and by additional physical infrastructure, including investments in additional storage capacity, and trans-Delta conveyance.

BDAC members Bob Raab and Roberta Borgonovo asked about technical analysis of the costs and assumptions associated with various water quality scenarios. Mr. Hall informed members

that technical analysis to date shows that bromide and tri-halomethanes are the most important water quality constituents of concern. Vice Chair McPeak noted that this topic is an example of the need to be explicit regarding assumptions, and conclusions of any analysis, specifically regarding the kinds of treatment and the costs for water treatment. Steve Arakawa (Metropolitan Water District of Southern California) stated that an independent scientific panel reviewed water quality parameters and prepared a report identifying various water quality scenarios and assumptions about quality. He added that an initial cost analysis would be available the week of December 15th. Ms. Borgonovo expressed a desire that CALFED staff prepare a similar analysis. BDAC member Byron Buck and Mr. Hall informed members that a sensitivity analysis of varying levels of water quality including the effect of source quality on water recycling was being prepared by the Agriculture/Urban caucus staff as follow-up to the independent scientific panel.

Vice Chair McPeak reviewed the upcoming BDAC schedule. The next meeting will be January 29, 1998 in Sacramento. It would be the last opportunity to provide input into the selection of the draft Preferred Alternative. The following meeting will be March 19th and 20th in southern California. Mr. Graff asked when the release of the draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) would occur. Vice Chair McPeak replied that it would be released sometime between January 29th and March.

Mary Selkirk (CALFED Program staff) stated that the BDAC Water Transfers Work Group's next meeting was scheduled for December 17th at 9:30 AM, rather than 1:30 PM as previously announced.

2. REVIEW FINAL ERPP SCIENTIFIC REVIEW PANEL REPORT & ERPP REFINEMENT PROCESS (Dick Daniel, Roberta Borgonovo)

Presentation

Dick Daniel (CALFED Program staff) and Ms. Borgonovo reported on Ecosystem Restoration Work Group (ERWG) and staff follow-up to the ERPP Scientific Review Panel. Mr. Daniel reminded BDAC members and the public of the process of the Scientific Review Panel and the Panel's key findings as reported at the November BDAC meeting and in the Panel's report. He turned to the recommendations from ERWG contained in the BDAC mailing of November 26, 1997. Vice Chair McPeak noted that BDAC would be asked for its overall agreement or disagreement with the Work Group recommendations. Recommendation #1 was to clarify the approach to restoration and rehabilitation. Ms. Borgonovo noted that ERWG recommended that a map showing the distribution of anticipated ecosystem restoration and rehabilitation efforts be prepared and that the Program should adopt an anti-degradation policy.

Mr. Daniel added that a near-term response to Recommendation #1 will be to include an appendix to the EIR/EIS that has an example map using the American River as a model. He added that the Program's number one priority is to preserve existing resources.

Mr. Daniel presented Recommendation #2: to simplify and focus the goals and approach of the ERPP and to produce an easily understand summary of the ERPP. Ms. Borgonovo and Ms. Notthoff stated that the Scientific Review Panel recommended that goals be explicit, quantifiable, attainable, and use a conceptual framework. Ms. Borgonovo added that this recommendation directly related to the following recommendations, especially #3-the need to develop conceptual models and #4-create an ERPP science program including hiring the necessary staff to complete the ERPP. She noted that agreement among the Agriculture/Urban caucus and environmentalists will help to move the ERPP forward. Mr. Daniel explained that part of Recommendation #2 is to write an executive summary or a strategic plan for the ERPP. He stated that Volume 3 of the ERPP on program implementation will be expanded so that it can serve as a strategic plan for the ERPP. A separate executive summary will also be available.

Discussion Points

Vice Chair McPeak, Ms. Borgonovo, BDAC members Stu Pyle and Alex Hildebrand, Mr. Daniel and Lester Snow discussed ERPP flows. A summary of flow recommendations contained in Volume 2 of the ERPP was presented and will be included in further work on the ERPP. Requests were made to compare, and present the comparison, of these recommended flows to present-day flows and to current flow standards. When added together the recommendations total 300,000 to 400,000 acre-feet of additional water for fish purposes.

- Mr. Hildebrand asked whether the ERPP proposes to convert 150,000 acres of land to wetlands in the Delta. He added that generally wetlands use more water per acre than agricultural uses in the Delta. He also requested that a summary be provided which details the water requirements associated with implementing the ERPP, explains the methodology of determining the water requirements, and identifies the sources of such water. Mr. Daniel responded that up to 30,000 acres are proposed for conversion to tidal wetlands. He added that there will be wildlife enhancements and that the ERPP also encourages "wildlife friendly" agricultural practices on other types of land in the Delta. He noted that the Program is preparing an analysis of water usage for habitat restoration purposes. Vice Chair McPeak advised BDAC members that analysis is iterative and ongoing.
- Mr. Buck stated that implementation principles should guide how the Program intends to achieve the ERPP targets. Vice Chair McPeak replied that the strategic plan would provide such an explanation. Ms. Notthoff added that this emphasized the need for simple goals. She repeated a request from previous meetings that a water balance sheet be prepared. Lester Snow explained that a framework for an ERPP strategic plan would be completed in the next 30 days. Within six months, the strategic plan would be filled out and conceptual models articulated.
- BDAC member Richard Izmirian requested that an explanation of a generic conceptual model be prepared.

- Mr. Pyle stated that fundamental assumptions about program implementation must be established at the policy level and not by scientists. Ms. Borgonovo stated that the strategic plan is a framework with policy implications. Mr. Daniel added that all parts of the ERPP need to be integrated together. He noted that the Scientific Review Panel identified the need to explain hypotheses resulting from conceptual models and ultimately to prepare predictive, quantitative models. Ms. Borgonovo stated that the next meeting of the ERWG is January 13, 1998 and that staff have been asked to bring work-to-date on conceptual models. She suggested that this work be included in BDAC packets.

Presentation Continued

Mr. Daniel presented Recommendation #4 (described above). Establishing a standing science panel with rotating membership in 1998 is supported by the CALFED agencies and may be based on the Interagency Ecological Program. He added that CALFED also intends to use locally-based scientific knowledge. Ms. Borgonovo pointed out that the Scientific Review Panel noted that there are inherent conflicts in the ERPP and that all parties must be involved to resolve those conflicts.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Pyle stated that implementation of adaptive management will also require expertise from knowledgeable non-scientists. Ms. Borgonovo agreed and explained that scientific information is embedded into overall implementation of the ERPP. Mr. Daniel responded that the Assurances Work Group is discussing a collaborative institution to implement the ERPP.
- Mr. Hildebrand commented that exotic species are increasing and that some ERPP goals will be less achievable over time.
- Vice Chair McPeak noted that these comments go to the heart of CALFED which is to restore the ecosystem consistent with the Solution Principles. She stated that BDAC is not ready to embrace the ERPP until the entire program is presented. She encouraged full dialogue on needs for the ecosystem.

Presentation Continued

Recommendation #5-clearly articulate and present the ERPP's hypotheses for scientific review was discussed next. Ms. Borgonovo stated that testing hypotheses is the basis for adaptive management and that the Scientific Review Panel recommended that implementation actions be undertaken, and the hypotheses tested and used to monitor results to determine needed adjustments. Mr. Daniel promised that the Program will have material to help the general public understand CALFED's commitment to responding to the Scientific Review Panel.

Chair Mike Madigan arrived at 11:30 AM.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Buck expressed that the Scientific Review Panel was useful.
- BDAC member Robert Meacher urged that future independent science review should include a watershed scientist and a resource economist to address upper watershed issues. Without this expertise it becomes the burden of the stakeholder to articulate this type of information.
- BDAC member Rosemary Kamei endorsed preparation of an ERPP strategic plan. Additionally, she urged that a more open technical and scientific process be used in the future. Such an approach might eliminate the layers of independent review called for in Recommendation #4.
- Mr. Stearns stated that the agricultural community views a strong ERPP as necessary to the overall CALFED program.
- Ms. Borgonovo noted the importance of a conceptual framework for the ERPP and learning from the experience in other parts of the country.
- Vice Chair McPeak summarized BDAC's recommendations at this point in the discussion. She noted calls for summaries of the ERPP recommendations regarding water flows and land conversions, the need for a strategic plan, and calls for incorporation of broader expertise in addition to scientific review.

Mr. Pyle agreed with the Vice Chair's summary. He expressed frustration about the lack of specifics on implementation over the next five years, such as allocation of money and resources and a timetable to support a comprehensive program. Ms. Borgonovo noted that the strategic plan framework would be in the EIR/EIS and would be completed during the following six months. Ms. Notthoff and Vice Chair McPeak urged that the strategic plan be included in the main body of the EIR/EIS and not only in an appendix.

Public Comment

- Gary Bobker (The Bay Institute) informed BDAC of a letter from environmental, agricultural and urban stakeholder groups addressing follow-up on the ERPP. The groups recommended that the strategic plan address: 1) clarity of the goals and objectives of the ERPP, 2) linkage of actions and objectives through the use of conceptual models, and 3) ERPP implementation steps. Mr. Bobker added that ERPP implementation actions should be prioritized. Mr. Bobker outlined steps for preparing the ERPP strategic plan. First, a team should be assembled to draft the strategic plan and this team should include conservation biologists, land-use planners and landscape ecologists. Second, the plan should be reviewed in a workshop-type setting to gain additional input from the full range

of expertise on the system. Thirdly, the strategic plan should undergo independent scientific review. He urged that work begin immediately. BDAC member Hap Dunning asked how Mr. Bobker proposed to proceed given a limited base of knowledge about how the Bay-Delta ecosystem works. Mr. Bobker replied that by articulating testable hypotheses actions to meet ERPP objectives could begin. He added that efforts and results would be tentative at first.

Mr. Bobker then commented on trade-offs associated with the overall CALFED solution and the further use of independent technical review. He stated that an adequate discussion of trade-offs is not possible until agreement is reached on the ERPP. He recommended that CALFED use a similarly rigorous process as the ERPP Scientific Review Panel for other outstanding issues, including demand management, water supply reliability and assurances.

- Stephen Zapoticzny (Southern California Water Committee and NutraSweet, Inc.) reviewed correspondence from the Southern California Water Committee to BDAC. He noted that NutraSweet has a major manufacturing facility in San Diego. He informed BDAC that when Monsanto recently acquired NutraSweet, concern was expressed by Monsanto about the reliability of that facility's water supply as it is a major factor in production of NutraSweet's products.

3. THE INTEGRATED PROGRAM & RESULTS OF THE INTERAGENCY DEVELOPMENT TEAM PROCESS (Lester Snow, Rick Woodard)

Presentation

Lester Snow reminded BDAC that the purpose of the Interagency Development Team (IDT) was to conduct an initial performance assessment of the three CALFED hybrid alternatives using the Distinguishing Characteristics introduced and described at previous BDAC meetings. As analysis by the IDT progressed, the number of Distinguishing Characteristics which showed significant differences between the alternatives dropped from 18 to 10. When the component of storage facilities was added to each alternative, the Water Supply Opportunities distinguishing characteristic revealed no significant difference between the alternatives and was dropped as well. Lester Snow noted that these were results of analysis to date and that the results were generalized for each alternative.

For the distinguishing characteristic, In-Delta Water Quality, results from the IDT analysis show that Alternative 2 will likely outperform Alternatives 1 and 3 and will be better than existing conditions.

Discussion

Mr. Buck asked whether a consistent set of operating assumptions was used by the IDT. He also asked if mitigation measures, such as supplying irrigation water directly from an isolated facility

to Delta agriculture, were part of the performance analysis. Rick Woodard (CALFED Program staff) replied that different operational scenarios showed the same performance relationship among the alternatives. He added that the comparisons to the Distinguishing Characteristics are currently focused on the unmitigated alternatives.

Presentation Continued

For the characteristic of Export Water Quality for the State Water Project and Central Valley Project, results from the IDT analysis show that Alternative 3 will likely outperform the other alternatives and will be better than existing conditions. Lester Snow noted that this is due to the direct connection of the isolated conveyance facility to the Sacramento River.

Discussion

Mr. Hildebrand asked if the performance of an alternative would vary depending upon the type of water year. He expressed concern regarding assessment of the consequences of the alternatives because it appeared that averaged water year data was used in the analysis. He added that the specific design of Alternative 2 would affect the ratio of bromides and total dissolved solids. Mr. Woodard replied that the IDT's analysis to date is based on a hydrologic record of 16 years. He added that additional data by different water year types and by month were available. Further, the pattern of differing performance among the alternatives will tend to remain the same over the long-term, thus providing sufficient information for the programmatic level of decision that is needed in Phase II.

Presentation Continued

Lester Snow presented the results for the characteristic of Export Water Quality for Contra Costa Water District. Results to date show that Alternative 2 would likely outperform the other alternatives and existing conditions.

Discussion Points

- Ms. Kamei asked for information on performance during critical dry periods. Mr. Woodard responded that this analysis is underway, but not yet completed. He added that he expects the results to show a similar relationship between the alternatives.
- Mr. Meacher asked if storage facilities were proposed for each alternative. Lester Snow replied that storage facilities of approximately three million acre-feet upstream of the Delta were proposed in each alternative.
- Mr. Buck asked if Alternative 2 would reduce bromides to the desired level of 50 micrograms per liter. Mr. Woodard replied that this was unlikely.

Presentation Continued

The IDT analysis for the characteristic of Delta Flow Circulation indicates that Alternative 3 would likely be the best performer. Lester Snow explained that it would re-establish flow patterns most similar to natural flow patterns and would reduce cross-Delta flow. Alternative 3 will likely perform the best in reducing the effects of entrainment on fish. All alternatives performed better than existing conditions.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Hall and Mr. Buck discussed the time period for the analysis for this characteristic. Mark Cowin (CALFED Program staff) stated that a 73-year period was used for modeling of river behavior and a 16-year period was used for modeling of flow activity in the Delta. Mr. Hall noted that the technical staff for the Agriculture/Urban caucus think that using longer time periods in the modeling could change the outcomes. Additionally, flow patterns during dry periods need to be analyzed as well. Agriculture/Urban technical staff are proceeding with dry year analysis and will share results with CALFED staff. The CALFED analysis for this distinguishing characteristic included meeting the X2 standard, and the flows and timing recommendations called for in the ERPP.
- Ms. Borgonovo, Ms. Notthoff, Mr. Hildebrand, Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Buck, Lester Snow and Pete Chadwick (member of the IDT) discussed flow patterns with the least negative effects on fisheries. It is important to note that of the alternatives, Alternative 3 best restores the flow patterns for both the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. However, none restore the magnitudes of flow that occurred prior to water supply development. To some, the significance of the negative effects of reverse flows is not clear, especially if adequate screening is used to block Sacramento River fish from the South Delta. Reconfiguring Alternative 2 in order to optimize its performance for several objectives should be considered. The re-configured design would use the South Fork of the Mokelumne to move water to the South Delta pumps. Concern about increasing flows on the South Fork focuses on possible negative impacts to its present-day high biological value. Staff are analyzing a proposal submitted by the Natural Resources Defense Council to reduce water usage by three million acre-feet.
- Ms. Borgonovo inquired whether the flow that would be transported through an isolated facility would be calculated as part of the export/inflow ratio. Lester Snow replied that it would not. Mr. Chadwick added that when the modeling for this alternative was performed additional constraints, such as not allowing further saltwater intrusion into the Delta, were included.

Presentation Continued

For the characteristic of Water Supply Opportunities, Alternatives 2 and 3 are likely to perform similarly and are only marginally better than Alternative 1. The reliability of water supply will

be based on opportunities for water transfers, demand management, improved water quality and new facilities.

Discussion

Discussion among Ms. Kamei, Vice Chair McPeak, Ms. Borgonovo and Lester Snow followed regarding the possible increase of water availability. Each alternative will likely increase water yield above existing conditions by approximately 750,000 to 900,000 acre-feet. This is due, in part, to proposed storage facilities and interties between the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project. It was noted that basing modeling on average Delta flow data can obscure the importance of water during different seasons and from year to year. Part of the CALFED decision includes shifting the timing of flows.

Presentation Continued

Lester Snow stated that Alternative 3 was the likely best performer for Operation Flexibility. All alternatives appear to provide improvements over existing conditions. He noted that diverting water supply to the proposed conveyance facility at Hood ensured that water supply operations were less affected by Delta conditions.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Izmirian asked about the status of real-time monitoring in the Delta. Mr. Chadwick replied that operational flexibility is only partly dependent on real-time monitoring.
- Mr. Hasseltine asked for clarification regarding what is measured by this characteristic. He noted that with an earlier characteristic water quality in Alternative 3 did not improve as much, yet with this characteristic it appears to have more improvement. Lester Snow replied that the Operational Flexibility characteristic is influenced greatly by improving conditions for the Delta smelt fishery while, at the same time, providing water of a certain quality to consumptive uses. He added that the modeling for the conveyance facility assumed a volume of 10,000 cfs, and that this volume would be 80% of the total volume of export water.
- Ms. Notthoff called for consistent terminology among all CALFED documentation.

Presentation Continued

Lester Snow stated that for the distinguishing characteristic of total cost, there was very little difference in performance of the alternatives. With respect to the characteristic of Difficulty to Assure Implementation, Alternative 1 was evaluated by the IDT as easiest to assure and Alternative 3 as the hardest. All alternatives were rated as more difficult to assure than the existing conditions.

Discussion

Mr. Hall, Ms. Notthoff, Mr. Buck, Mr. Hildebrand, Ms. Kamei, Ms. Borgonovo, Vice Chair McPeak and BDAC member Roger Strelow discussed these characteristics. A view was expressed that the more flexible the system, the more likely the Solution Principles would be met. Also, the existing conditions could not be assured. On the other hand flexibility can apply to all situations and assurances could be met or could be broken. The Common Pool serves as a type of assurance. An isolated conveyance facility would eliminate the common interest in the Delta. With respect to the ability to pay, it was noted that funding from water users and from all sources is limited. While some parties assume that adjustments in the CALFED alternative could be made after implementation has begun, this may not be realistic. It was noted that the present system of water conveyance through the Delta is limited in its ability to provide water for both environmental and for consumptive uses. Some thought that Alternative 1 best meets the Solution Principles, while others expressed that Alternative 3 does so. Support was expressed for considering modification of Alternative 2 proposed earlier in the meeting. It was noted that determining the magnitude of differences between alternatives from the material presented at the BDAC meeting was difficult.

Public Comment

- Marla Miller (West Sacramento) commented that there was a lack of effort to find new sources of water and that the time frame for analysis of the CALFED alternatives was inadequate. She added that inadequate attention was being paid to the problem of land subsidence and that more attention should be directed towards groundwater recharge.

4. REPORTS FROM BREAK-OUT GROUPS (Eugenia Laychak, Paul Schwarz, Mary Selkirk)

BDAC members were asked to discuss the following questions in the break-out groups:

1. What is your assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of each alternative as characterized by the IDT? How would you revise the analysis?
2. Keeping in mind the Solution Principles, please discuss the following trade-offs:
 1. In Alternative 1, the IDT process revealed a significant trade-off between ease of assurance on the one hand, and lack of operation flexibility on the other. How can this trade-off be resolved? How can this alternative be revised to reduce the significance of this trade-off?
 2. In Alternative 3, a significant trade-off emerged between minimal diversion effects on fisheries on the one hand and difficulty in providing adequate assurances on the other. How can this trade-off be resolved? How can this alternative be re-configured to reconcile this trade-off?
3. Based on discussion of the above questions, is there any alternative which in your opinion can be ruled out at this point?

For question #1, common themes from the three break-out groups were that 1) supporting data for the presented bar charts that compared the alternatives against the distinguishing characteristics was needed, and 2) inconsistencies existed between the information on bar charts and the summary sheet on the strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives.

With regard to question #2, resolving trade-offs, the following general comments were raised:

- Two of the break-out groups re-framed the trade-offs as, the cost for improvements to the ecosystem, in-Delta water quality and export water quality.
- The significance of the Common Pool concept in a solution was discussed in two of the break-out groups. It was noted in one of the groups, that a solution that minimizes the interest of one of the stakeholders in the Common Pool creates a disincentive for that party to share in maintaining the supply system and the Delta.
- One group noted that with the addition of storage facilities, Alternative 1 might be workable, whereas without storage it probably was not acceptable. Another group noted that the storage component for each of the alternatives had not undergone full public review and that this component might influence to acceptability of an alternative.
- Two groups reported on discussions for resolving trade-offs for Alternative 3. Constraining the capacity of a conveyance facility to 3,000 cfs was one suggestion. Additional suggestions included legislation, constitutional amendments, contracts, and water rights.

In response to question #3, none of the break-out groups unanimously recommended that a particular alternative be dropped at this time. One group, however, leaned towards eliminating Alternative #3 and another towards Alternative #1. A suggestion arose that each alternative should be evaluated against a minimum set of threshold criteria covering ecosystem health, water quality and water supply, to determine if the alternative met these minimum criteria.

Discussion Points

- Mr. Pyle suggested that the alternatives be rated using the Solution Principles and that the results be shown in graphic form. He added that Alternative 1 should be eliminated as it could not meet future water demands. Vice Chair McPeak suggested that BDAC could do a rating exercise such as that proposed by Mr. Pyle.
- Mr. Hall suggested that the successful solution must meet minimum thresholds. These thresholds are attaining certain water quality standards and recovery of species covered by the Endangered Species Act. Neither the fishery nor water supply should be at risk in the future. He added that it is necessary to clearly communicate the factors which drive the public policy choices. He requested that this material be available at the January

BDAC meeting. Lester Snow replied that some of the factors are embedded in the distinguishing characteristics. He added that some examples could be provided in January. Vice Chair McPeak noted that BDAC members are trying to better understand the constraints and imperatives that underlie the selection of the draft Preferred Alternative.

- Mr. Raab commented there was lack of firm knowledge regarding upcoming modifications of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) drinking water quality standards. He requested independent review of proposed standards. Mr. Buck countered by stating that water agencies are required to implement Stage 1 standards in 1998. Additionally, the agencies are active participants in discussions with EPA on Stage 2 standards. Vice Chair McPeak noted that discussion of water quality and disinfection by-products should be on the January meeting agenda. She requested that the Environmental Water Caucus clarify and present its views on demand management at the January meeting.

Vice Chair McPeak, Mr. Dunning, Mr. Hildebrand, Mr. Hall, and Ms. Borgonovo then discussed with Lester Snow the storage component of CALFED alternatives. Water storage is very expensive; while it has benefits, disadvantages also exist. To date, storage options have not received as much public review as have conveyance options. Additionally, it was not clear to BDAC if all CALFED agencies were supportive of additional storage. Lester Snow noted that the agencies had not taken a position regarding the need for and extent of new storage facilities. He added that public review would happen as part of the review of the draft EIR/EIS and the topic could be on the BDAC January agenda. Desire for information on how water storage affects water distribution and possible re-allocation was expressed. For water agencies, improvements in water supply are necessary. While changes in water conveyance are a partial improvement, increasing overall supply through the addition of storage is also necessary. Another request for information focused on the integration of storage, flood management, and implementation of the ERPP.

Vice Chair McPeak reviewed the topics for the January BDAC meeting. These were:

- A comparison of the alternatives to the Solution Principles
- Discussion on demand management
- Discussion on water quality standards; Vice Chair McPeak suggested that the EPA be included in the discussion
- Discussion on storage
- Discussion on improving both reliability of water supply and fishery conditions
- Discussion on export water quality and effects on fisheries
- Review of work on the objectives of the ERPP and summary information on ERPP flows, temperature and timing.
- Discussion on the interaction of water storage and agricultural water use
- Discussion on the effects of water storage on outflow to the Bay

BDAC members requested that the following information and topics also be addressed:

- Location of storage
- Report on CALFED staff's assessment of the significance of differences between the alternatives
- Discussion on the minimum thresholds suggested earlier by Mr. Hall
- Discussion on financing of the preferred alternative

Vice Chair McPeak commented that this may be more than can be discussed in January, but that all of these topics need discussion eventually.

5. CHAIR'S REPORT CONTINUED

There was no further discussion under this agenda item.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT

- Tom Zuckerman (South Delta Water Agency) commented that when the California Water Plan was conceived, proponents anticipated more storage would be built than what actually occurred. He added that water contracts were based on that projected yield, so that demand developed for non-existent water supply. He concluded by stating that system flexibility is derived more from storage than from the type of Delta conveyance. Mr. Dunning asked Mr. Zuckerman to briefly review the history of legislative discussion regarding a conveyance facility. Mr. Zuckerman noted the 1982 initiative opposing the Peripheral Canal. He added that the Burns-Porter Act in 1959 established the common pool concept as part of management of the Delta.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.